

*To the memory of Prof. Dr. Yahya Kemal Kaya  
who devoted himself to the improvement of the  
Turkish higher education.*

## THE TURKISH HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE COURSE OF REFORMATION

by

Prof. Dr. ZİYA BURSALIOĞLU

The aim of this article is to review briefly the early reforms of the Turkish university and to compare impartially the last two laws governing the Turkish higher education with implementative evaluations. The main topic will be the system of the Turkish higher education. Nevertheless systems are administered by men, therefore it is impossible to evade administrative behaviors which function systems.

### *77:\*? Turkish University in Retrospect*

After the Turkish Republic had been founded in 1923, İstanbul Darülfünun was transformed into İstanbul University in the year of 1933. The reasons for this reformation were declared by the Minister of Education at the time, Dr. Reşit Galip, as the lack of coordination among faculties and other units to provide scientific research and publication due to the outside personal activities of instructors.

The law 4936 passed in 1946, the beginning of multiparty system, and the laws 115, 119 enacted in 1960 after the military revolution aimed at introducing administrative autonomy and academic freedom into the Turkish university and they vere ensured by the article 120 of the 1961 Constitution. It was claimed that because of this Constitutional autonomy, universities were placed outside any effective supervision and evaluation except by self-elected administrators. Therefore, universities did not even abide by the plans and programs envisaged by the State Planning Department and the Parliament. The persistent decisions of university senates to keep enrolments down and even to lower them, the high concentration of full and associate professors in metropolitan cities (İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir) in contrast to those with serious vacancies in the countryside are claimed as some of the drawbacks of this autonomy (1).

After the second military intervention in 1972, in 1973 the "Law of Universities" numbered P50 was passed and although a **Council of Higher Education (CHE)** was established by this law, Ankara University took the case to the Constitutional Court and had it overruled on the grounds that the government representatives in the Council outnumbered those of universities.

After the third military intervention in 1980. the new Constitution granted not administrative but only scientific autonomy to universities, and the new "Law of Higher Education", numbered 254 was enacted in 1981 implementing this limited autonomy. It constitutes an amusing contrast that, as stated by Selçuk Kantarcıoğlu, some of the members of the reestablished CHE were the leading academic administrators who enjoyed and exercised the previous full autonomy (2).

### **The Law Of Higher Education**

This law which was followed by a flow of regulations aimed at the integration of the objectives, structures, and processes of higher education. it aimed at the integration of higher education not only of all universities including the ivvo with special status.s. but also all institutions of higher education, although most of them used to be within the jurisdiction of the Ministry of National Education. As a result, all the teacher training institutions with three or four year instructional periods were transferred and attached to closest universities without sufficient orientation time. The pondered philosophy of this quick transaction was not only to raise the standards of teacher training, but also to free the training enterprise from political infiltration and ministerial violations. As a result, 22 colleges (faculties) of education and 2a junior colleges of education were created out of previous teacher training institutions. This has certainly been the universal trend in the history of teacher education: however, achievement has been determined by the situation of readiness. Such a structural and administrative integration has long been indispensable in Turkey particularly for secondary education which consists of more than 20 types of secondary schools. A true integration at the level of higher education will probably force secondary education, although a reverse development, in the same direction.

The objectives of higher education in the new law, partly inspired by those objectives previously determined and mentioned, can be summarized as follows:

*To train a student so as*

- 1 - To develop and sustain his loyalty to Atatürk nationalism in the direction of his reforms and principles,
- 2 - To possess the cultural, moral and human values of the Turkish nation,
- 3 - To consider social interest above his own,
- 4 - To love his country, nation, and family.

5 - To be conscious of his duties and responsibilities, towards the Turkish Republic and to show them in his behavior,

6 - To think independently and scientifically within the world perspective,

7 - To be respectful to human rights,

8 - To develop physically and psychologically in a balanced way,

9 - To acquire the knowledge and skill of an occupation so as to make a good living,

10 - To contribute to the social, economic and cultural development of the Turkish State in order to promote its partnership in contemporary civilization.

### ***The University Subject to Integration and Reformation***

The university is the most difficult educational institution to change in almost every country. As the representative of one of the three elements of the Ottoman administration, the Turkish university maintained this characteristic even after the periods of military administration.

Originally the Turkish university was organized after the German model under the influence of the German scholars who took refuge in İstanbul University and later in Ankara University during the two world wars. Following American aid and influence, new universities were established accordingly. But the classical university maintained its organizational structure and administrative tradition within the framework of the general university laws. Although four university laws were passed after the foundation of the Republic, the most contrasting ones are the last two. Academic, bureaucratic, judiciary, military and lay circles vary distinctly in their evaluations. For comparative purposes, some organizational and administrative dimensions of these two laws are explained below.

### ***The Size of Decision Making Organs***

The new law significantly reduced the size of the university senate and the faculty council which are authorized to make academic decisions. The senate lost one third of its participants, due to the one senator elected from each faculty plus the dean. Formerly the faculty council was composed of full and associate professors the number of which exceeded one or two hundreds as in the case of Faculty of Letters or Medicine. Presently it consists of one assistant, two associate, and three full professors plus department heads. In order to keep the principle of smallness, some faculties of social sciences were reduced to three

departments of specialization. This formal but not functional initiation aroused justifiable criticism. But the academic administrators already displeased or unhappy with large-scale decision organs welcomed the spirit of the principle in general.

The administrative council of the university and that of the faculty remained almost the same in size, but changed in function. First they are considered as assisting, in a sense, supporting organs to the president and to the dean respectively. Second, most of the functions of the faculty council are transferred to the administrative council. Therefore, the academic administrator who previously avoided calling for the former frequently because of the difficulties in getting a quorum is now obliged to meet this organ twice a semester and can work with more authority through a smaller body with ability for making quick decisions.

#### ***Distribution of Authority and Responsibility***

The new law envisaged the transfer of authority from council to administrators. The president and the dean are now equipped with more authority which previously belonged to the senate and the faculty council. Even the department head who used to be a symbol in the department is now charged with full authority and responsibility of departmental decisions and their implementations. The centralization of authority involved both academic and administrative functions. Like the new authority of the dean to compose a jury for assistant professors or direct disciplinary punishment of a student after due investigation without taking such matters to the council concerned. Similarly, much authority of the senate is now centralized on the president.

#### ***Administrative Hierarchy and Team***

For the administration of higher education, a "Council of Higher Education" was founded by the new law. One third of its members is appointed by the Head of State (President of Turkey), one third by the Council of Ministers, and the last third is elected by the Interuniversity Council. In addition, two members from the Ministry of National Education and one from the General Staff are somewhat ex-officio. The new law also provided another "Council of Supervision for Higher Education" the members of which is elected by the CİİF.

A government decree, valid as law, passed on December 21, 1987, changed the Article 6 of the new law, and divided the CİİE into three organs as the General Council, the President, and the Executive Committee. This division rendered the system more closed from the

viewpoint of participation in decision making, because the fundamental principle of democratic administration is not to increase the executive power, but to increase the degree of participation. From the Article 8 of the regulations based on this decree, it is understood that the authority to select deans can be delegated to the Executive Committee and has been so. On the other hand, the Article 130 of the Constitution makes it imperative that deans should be selected and appointed by the C11E. The fact that a function and authority allocated by the Constitution was delegated by a decree and regulations created a legal issue open to discussion. While half of the professors of law with whom the writer consulted expressed their opinions in this direction, the other half stated the case simply against the Constitution. The significant part of it is not the fact that more than a hundred deans have been appointed in this way since then, but how the institutions outside the system of higher education like opposition parties, and inside the system like six faculties of law overlooked this at least debatable legal issue.

A most significant and controversial change introduced by the new law was the replacement of elective procedure by appointive procedure. Previously, the president of a university was elected by full and associate professors of that university. The dean was elected by the faculty council composed of the same academics. *The new law requires an administrative team.* According to it, the president of a university was appointed by the Council of State from among the four nominees, including outsiders, presented by the CFIF until 1992. Similarly, the dean is appointed by the CFIF from among the three nominees presented by the president. The department head previously elected by the faculty council is indirectly appointed by the dean. In arguing their case, the proponents of this procedure gave examples of the disadvantages of the elective theory attributed to the elective system. The opponents, in turn, concentrated on the cases of political infiltration particular to the appointive system. Both parties missed the quality factor which surpasses these two. In other words, without clear-cut specifications of the qualities of the academic administrator at every echelon, each approach would entail its own probable risks. Nevertheless, by a basic principle of administration, a superior should at least have a voice in the selection of his subordinates, if not a direct right. There were cases when a senate did not elect the candidate of the president as his vice president.

#### **77?e Academic Title and Service**

According to the former law, promotion to full professorship required the evaluation of a candidate through a jury organized by the faculty council,

and the approval of the jury evaluation by both the faculty council and the university senate. The new law authorizes the president to organize a jury for the candidate and the jury reports are evaluated in the university administrative council which legally is not an academic organ.

Due to excessive inbreeding, the academic cadre of old universities have been unnecessarily larger. On the other hand, the new universities have always been in need of academic support. The new law stipulated three years service in another university as a prerequisite for promotion to full professorship. Also full professors with less than eight years of service would be subject to rotational service, under certain conditions. The first stipulation was removed in 1958. The second has been a case of informal agreement between the president and the dean.

In order to provide academic flow to new universities, three years service after doctorate as one of the conditions for promotion to assistant professorship was not required in another university besides the candidate's own. This condition was also omitted some time ago.

As far as the academic load is concerned, it is at least ten hours a week; for full and associate professors. The relative weights of the elements of this load; such as instruction, practice, advising etc. are determined by the faculty. Presidents, deans, directors of institutes and higher schools are exempt from academic load. Their assistants and department heads are charged with half of this load.

### ***The Disciplinary Organs and Procedures***

The new law charged the president as the disciplinary head of the university, and the dean as that of the faculty, by the same token. (The administrative councils of the university and the faculty should serve as disciplinary organs.)

As for the judiciary cases, previously the disciplinary organ for the academic staff was the senate which considered and concluded the motions based on due investigation and made by the faculty administrative council. Because of lengthy agenda of the senate and diverse evaluations of its large number of members, such cases took months and years to be concluded. The new legislation authorized the presidential team-president and vice presidents - to consider and conclude such cases involving academic administrators. A committee composed of the three members of the university administrative council would deal with such cases involving instructional members in the same way. In both cases, the decision would be made whether to open final investigation through judiciary organs.

The disciplinary organs and procedures did not change significantly in the new law. Such cases are to be dealt with at the faculty level as before, except that the dean is now authorized to decide independently, after due investigation, on the specific article of disciplinary regulations, without taking the case to the university administrative council.

#### **Financial Organs And Procedures**

By the previous law, each faculty was a legal entity which caused the university to be a federation of faculties. As a result, the dean was the final authority to approve payments. Also each faculty had its own budget which was negotiated and settled with the Ministry of Finance for current expenditures and the State Planning Department for investments. Draft and consolidated budgets were finally discussed and approved by the Parliament.

The status of each faculty as a legal entity created coordinative difficulties even in the areas of academic calendars and requirements at various levels. Budgetary separation not only contributed to these difficulties but also required personal and political contacts on the part of each faculty administrator. The new law permitted status as a legal entity only, to the university and required budgetary integration. Only the president is authorized to approve payments with possible delegation to vice presidents and deans, which is preferred by the presidents of large universities.

The new legislation provides for various financial facilities such as the exemption from taxes in case of grants, exceptional status from public laws of general accounts and auctions, and full allocation of revolving capital incomes to generating units. In the last case, half of such income was utilized for the needs of the unit, and the other half was to be distributed among the staff members of that unit.

#### **Political Involvement And Public Service**

The new law banned membership in and activity on behalf of any political party by academic staff and student body. With the exception of public service, membership in any association was subject to the permission of the president upon the approval by the dean. Nevertheless if any academic is called to SCIA/C in the Council of Ministers, the Parliament, or other public institution without being attached to any party, his right to return to his university at the end of such service is reserved.

Other personnel matters such as salary scales, leaves etc. are subject to the

"University Personnel Law". Those rights and cases which are not mentioned in the special laws of the university are subject to general laws.

### **Centralization                      Versus                      Decentralization**

The new and legalized trend in the Turkish university administration from decentralization to centralization has been perceived differently by the affected institutions and individuals according to their frames of reference. Those involved in political activity and even indoctrination were the most unhappy because of the alleged state control at the cost of academic freedom. Those who taught few hours a week and spent the rest of their times in moonlight jobs were displeased. Those who sincerely and candidly believed that university administration should be different from that of a public institution were in a state of anticipation of further evaluation of prospective implementation. Those who worked full time and were too conscientious to evade their professional duties were glad because of the legal constraints and probable justice. And there were other groups as well who perhaps reacted differently.

After 1980 military intervention, a Council of National Security was composed of the commanders of four forces under the Chief of General Staff. A Consultative Assembly was established in October 1981 allegedly composed of impartial persons appointed by the Council of National Security. Nevertheless, a considerable number of them were on the election lists of political parties two years later and became the members of the Grand National Assembly after the 1983 elections. The recent law of Higher education was adopted by the Council of National Security, because it might not have been passed through the Assembly, at least as it was.

During military administration, universities were asked to elaborate on a new legislative proposal, and among other academicians, the writer also produced two articles on the organizational anatomy of and innovative strategies for the university (3, 4). But a reactionary law was already premediated for the university which was held responsible for the student movements before 1980. In fact, these movements were essentially provoked by political parties and their extensions. The article 7/1 of the law states that "Those who act against the objectives, principles and order envisaged in this law shall be transferred to another institution of higher education for reevaluation, or shall be discharged upon the request of the university president, or directly within normal procedure". This sword of Damocles over the head of the academician has rendered all optimistic interpretations of academic freedom dubious.



### ***The Council of Higher Education***

A permanent characteristic of the Cİİh has been its composition and recomposition *usu ally from the one balj' oj 'political spectrum*. This trend has generally reflected itself in the appointment of academic administrators. Although at the initial term a few impartial cases were considered harmless, such was not the case later. After the 1983 elections and the reestablishment of civilian government, this trend expanded as the result of the eastern and somewhat religious oriented foreign policy. Therefore, any critical evaluation of the press, academic or professional circles were reacted to through ideological role defense. One of the early indices of this expansion was the tactless decision of the CHE to permit female students to wear turbans (5), which afterwards raised an headache even for the government. The replacement of successful but impartial academic administrators, the refusal of administrative candidates strongly committed to Atatürk's preponderant philosophy have been among later indices.

The fact that every professional organization like the military council, a bar, a medical board etc. is composed of the members of the same profession was unheeded in the recent law; and as a result, bureaucrats have always formed almost half of the members of the CFIE. Besides their unfamiliarity with the present and dynamic issues of higher education, with the exception of a nostalgic look back to their college times, the evaluation of academicians by those who did not pass through such stages either administratively or academically was the most unaccustomed function of the CHE.

In most countries educational administration has remained at the amateur level from kindergarten to university inclusive. As a result the practice of this kind of administration has been deeply influenced by the basic concepts and principles of the field in which the educational administrator is specialized. And this effect has been deepest at the university level, because specialization is so.

From the very beginning, the CFIE has suffered from the lack of balance in terms of primary disciplines in the university. This entailed the amusing contrast that no professor of *education* was elected to the Council of Higher Education until 1992. It might have originated partly from the misconception that every university professor is a specialist in education. In parentheses, *the recently established Turkish Academy of Sciences reflects the same trend*. Some of the members of the CITE were former academic or bureaucratic administrators. But the immediate future still

existed. Some others perceived themselves "such stuff as dreams were made of".

Some academic administrators suggest that the CIE should be maintained as an organ of coordination which is one of the phases of the administrative process. Therefore, to attribute this function to the CHE invites its partnership in the executive process, if it is what they wish. First of all, the need for a coordinative extra organ in a system implies the failure of subsystems to realize this function. Secondly, once coordination is owned as an executive function, it ought to be fulfilled by the interuniversity Council which is usually composed of the executives of the whole system, that is, university presidents, plus university senators in advisory capacity. If the Interuniversity Council had been so conscious of this responsibility as to staff itself technically in the past, there would perhaps have been no need for such an extra organ as the CIE.

The president of the CNF, İhsan Dođramacı, an internationally renowned academician, the founder and long-time president of Maaelepe University, an indefatigable executive over 70, has been recognized as an autocratic leader. Therefore, no group or individual opposition has survived in the CNF. Power without opposition is neither infallible, nor enjoyable. The two dilemmas of leadership behavior are that either the leader believes in his undisputable success, or his close followers make him believe so, which is more detrimental, for reasons of their own. The truth is usually discovered and accepted at the very end.

The CIE has been a matchless scapegoat for whatever has gone wrong in universities, because it centralized the most trivial authorities, with little discretion left to presidents, and almost none to deans. Consequently, the press, academic circles, recently joined by the Parliament and government representatives declared the CIE a free fire zone. First, an important member of the party in power claimed that the Law of Higher Education failed to provide radical solutions for problems, and the result obtained at the end of five years was inefficiency and failure (1), State Minister Adnan Kahveci prepared a draft law for higher education with radical changes. The most acceptable part of the draft was a CIE to be composed of academicians only, and the most questionable part was the introduction of board of trustees fairly open to further political infiltration (7). Next day President Dođramacı defended his Council and qualified the change as a political choice (8).

During the debates on 1988 budget in the Assembly, the CIE was severely criticized by opposition parties, but defended by the Motherland Party in

povver (9), which once more revealed the political iclentity ot the CHE. Neverthele.ss, the Minister of National Education, Hasan Celal Güzel, stated that he agreed vvith most of the criticisms. He also clarTiecl hy saying that they did not intend to eliminate the CHE, but the c vvere mistakes to be corrected (10).

One can only ask why the party in povver and the government became so suddeny and critically interested in the CHE. Certainly serious hesitations and eriteisms have been expressed by dependable press and academicians. First, the nevv lavv has alienated senior membtrs \who retired in significant numbers vvhile discouraging prospeetive ones. Because the nevv lavv has eliminated tenure, only a few graduaies vvith satisfactory recoicls applied for academi vacancies (11). Seconcl, politically motivated behavior of some academic administrators appointed by or imposed on the CHE created anxiety among academicians for vvhich the CFİF vvas held responsibJe. Third, the lack of long term pol cy and planning resulted in arbitrary and sometimes contradictory decisions in regulations and clecrees vvhich created confusion in practice. For instance, graduate regulations changed ten rimes in lour years, and more la' er (12). The consec|uence vvas a numher of cases taken to and ovumled by administrative courts. Fourth, it vvas claimed that Turkish universities have lagged behind industy. because. their organizational strueture has failed to meet contemporaı needs (13)- A repon prepared by the State Planning Department claimed no advancement in medical training since the foundation of the CFİF CM). İbrahim Ceylan, a vvell knowr Mirgeon claimed that because ot recent laculties of medicine opened vvithout sufficient instructional staff and material and some on political bc sis, the Turkish medicine has been in a state of crises in the lası ten years (14). Also, a study on medical training shovved that artificial increase m student quotas affected this training negatively (16).

The same reservations and anxiety vvere expressed in terms ol elenfistry training and the measure vvas proposed as to close some colleges recently opened (17). Such criticisms gave good grounds for the panv :.nd the government in povver to change the lavv. and perhaps President Dođramacı. Thus, the university vvas ohliged to choose the least ol tvvo evils, betvveen the present and the prospeetive lavv. Neverthele.ss, in an opinion pou, university presidents expressed their hesitaiions vvith respect to establishing of board of rrustses vvhich they claimed vvoukl politicize the university (1<S). The Kahveci dralr vvas crilicized that it repeated the same inllexible strueture lor ali universities. vvhereas a framevvork of broad legal guidelines vvoulcl suffice instead ot such details as how to evaluate student achievemenı etc. (19). Anolhe" scholar

claimed that board of trustees system for the Turkish higher education would create only chaos (20).

A similar but smaller organ reestablished by the recent law is the Council of Supervision for Higher Education. Five members of this organ are selected by the CHE; three from Court of Appeals, Court of Accounts, and Supreme Administrative Court; and two by the Ministry of National Education. The last two were meant from the Ministerial cadre in order to establish coordination between higher education and other subsystems of educational system, but this connection was later disregarded and misused by the election of others outside the cadre. The Council of Supervision has been ineffective since its foundation, although the members appointed to this organ have been worthy of their positions. The ineffectiveness came as a result of not applying the universal process and not providing evaluative reports to academic institutions and administrators. This certainly gave the CHE a free hand to relieve some successful administrators, and to keep some unsuccessful ones. Nevertheless, the writer identified and criticised this negligence repeatedly (21).

### **Academic Freedom**

One of the most controversial issues in the university has certainly been academic freedom even under ordinary conditions. It has evoked more controversy in this transitional period. The opponents of the new law have persistently held that this freedom was reduced if not entirely eliminated. Under the initial impact of the new law disciplinary investigations of the academicians who criticised the law or its implementative consequences were conducted. Some academic administrators conducted or requested such investigations under false pretences. Some of such requests were returned by the CHE, some others were overruled by administrative courts, and some ended in punishment; but all caused psychological incursion for academicians. As time went on, both the CHE and later administrators became somewhat tolerant; perhaps because increasing criticisms by the press, political and academic circles have intimidated them. President Doğramacı, usually as the one proponent of the law and its implementative frictions, claimed that they did not call to accounts even those who conducted research on Manasın (22), as if no such study could be made in the university. On the other hand, his vice-president Kemal Karhan stated that not only Manasın but also theocratic state order should be instructed, as if the latter is the antithesis of the former (23). It ought to be pointed out that extreme disciplinary attitudes were shown by rather a few academicians fanatically

committed to a certain political philosophy, although some of them owned contrary commitments before the military intervention and the last law.

A public opinion poll conducted by the Milliyet newspaper showed that % 73 of those consulted believed that universities did not have academic freedom (24). Due to the lack of this freedom, universities which used to think and react before the law have been silent at the present (25). Therefore, while political interdicts put by military administration have slackened, academic ones were still in effect (26). The president of the Technical University in İstanbul, Kemal Kafalı, wrote that academic freedom is the indispensable element for a healthy generation of science and technology (27). Events following the publication of the instant article may constitute a dependable criterion of academic freedom in Turkish universities.

#### **Administrative and Academic Succession**

A review of university presidents initially appointed by the CHE under the present law shows that about one third came from medical science, the specialty of the president, and one fifth from Hacettepe University, his former university. Some university presidents were in position before the law and maintained previous organizational status as academic circles predicted they would, but in some universities there was a rapid turnover of presidents within six years which proved that all appointments were not judicious after all. The mobility in case of deans was even higher without much regard to administrative success or competence. Inexplicably, of 22 faculties of education, only two had deans as professors of education appointed by the CHE until 1988 (28). The classification and distribution of academic cadres entailed various actions which were enumerated in detail and qualified as implementations not becoming to contemporary age (29). Universities in developed countries reflect a free climate and this is the university reform which our colleagues long for (30).

Although by the law and the decrees of the CHE, there have been many fluctuations in case of academic promotions. In order to increase the number of instructional staff in the institutions of higher education annexed to universities, teachers who worked at least five years in these institutions were granted doctoral degrees upon the recommendation of jury and the approval of the university senate without the requirements of doctoral courses or thesis (31). But five months later, this decree was modified and introduced the obligation to write a doctoral thesis (32). During the five months between two decrees, some teachers were claimed to receive doctoral degrees in return of almost no academic

productivity, vvhile there vvere researeh assistants vvho spent years af loil before attaining the same degree.

İn case of academic promotion, the most controversial issnes have been those of assistant professors and full professors. By the nev lavv, any researeh assistant vvho received a doctoral degree had to serve three years in his university in order to apply lor assistant professorship. but coı İd do so in another university vvithout time limit. Although the aim vvas to promote applications to universities in the countryside, *projesyional deL>elo[.)ineut ii'c/s basud on i>eoi>iripby*, vvhile linancial incentives and subsiclized lodging lacilifies vvoulcl have seived such a purpose fetter. Nevertheless. sometime later this time limit vvas omitted by the CI Ih, but not the inecjualities it engendered in the past such as recognizing priorities lor those vvho vvent and seived in the countryside.

in case of promotion to associate professorship. vvhile a thesis vvas recjiired and evaluafed lav an Interuniversity jury before, the nav lavv replaced this recjuirement vvith the evaluation of ali the publicalion.- of a candidate vvhich renclered evaluation dilticult. By a recent decree of the CHE, to vvait four years to apply tor associate professorship vvas nt longer demandecl, but five vear duration stili remamecl in effect :oi full professorship. İlere lied another contradielory policy of academic promotion. İf a certain duration is indispensable for academic development, it should be valicl for ali aehelons.

Eor promotion tea full professorship, so numerotis vvere the decisions and procedures aclopteccl that eventually ten kinels of full professcar s vvere invented (33) (31). The confusican reached its climax vvhen Pies dent Dođramacı vvas claimed to have stated that an associate professor of agnculture ccaulel as vell be a full professor of history (35). One caf the most debatable kinels vvas to conler this title, instead of honorary cloctorate, to vell-knowvn, car not so, musicians and artists. According to informal resources, 67 full professors, 187 associate professors. a ne 191 assistant professors accjuirecl these academic degrees. Some caf them vvere distinguished instruetears in their fields, but this has not been the conventieanal way to academic promotion in Turkish universities. Besides it renclered the statistical elata can the subject caf increases in instructional staff clubious. Another kinci vvas cjualifiecl as "Hulleci Professcar" vvho vvas favourably promoted in another metropolitan university besides his ovvn, instead of serving in the countryside\*.

Ehille \vas a marital transfer in the İskimic kıv by vvlieli lle \vile- wlio vvas divor eti lıy her hus.bancl was lemporarily maniecl lo another so ihai lie lömieTııı.shancl cout I marry her again. But not in ali cases the wife or the Mic-eessive hus.bancl löjlov eti the prephinned transaction.

The new law introduced a new commodity named "instructional element" into the academic market. Thus, anyone such as a research assistant, specialist, translator, or planner acquired academic rank as soon as appointed, although he could not function accordingly. This incognito was later used to manipulate statistics which appeared in the data provided by local educational sources, in the so-called World Bank report, in which student-instructor ratio in Turkish higher education was stated as 1 to 15, and even lower in medical schools (36).

In spite of lowered standards and artificial measures to increase the number of academic staff, the gap created by the recent law was not easy to close. About 2000 full and associate professors are claimed to have parted from the university for various reasons, while ten more universities were opened and student population rose to half a million. In metropolitan universities, not only student instructor ratios, but also weekly teaching hours went beyond the limits of efficiency (37). Some of those which contributed to new universities in the past had to accept academic help from them, or from bureaucracy. A university in Ankara opened a doctoral program in educational administration with no full or associate professor in this field on its staff, although such programs were subject to the approval of the CİİE.

#### ***Student Achievement and Organizational Climate***

By the new law, a student who failed to make a preestablished grade average at the end of midterm exams was not entitled to take a second attempt of final exam. This has increased the drop-out rate in universities, created pressures on political organs, and eventually three academic amnesties were passed by the Parliament in the years of 1983, 84, 86, in order to give more chances to drop-outs and prospective ones. But concession is like a floor ajar, and naturally more amnesties were required by students and their associations later in 1988, 1991, 1992 and 1993 (38). It is hard to imagine any educational or legislative power which intervenes so frequently with student evaluation. But the Minister of National Education, Hasan Celal Güzel, as a politician stated that 60000 students equalled 200000 votes; although amnesty should not be perceived that way. Therefore, he was not against amnesty (39). Thus, the dominant factor in the solution of a crisis in higher education was officially declared.

On the other hand, students complained about the oppressive climate in universities, and asked for greater freedom of thought and speech. They organized protest walks from İstanbul and İzmir to Ankara even with

some parents accompanying them (40). Some government and academic circles claimed political motives behind such movements. Even the former Minister of National Education, Metin Emiroğlu, stated that they had seen this movie many times (41). But there were more things on the screen "than dreamed of by his own philosophy". Although some academicians were against such tolerance which would do good to nobody including students (42), others held that the education provided for the youth has been insufficient (43).

While some political motives and even agitators might have been operated behind such movement, it should not be overlooked that, like every military intervention, the 1980 era also intimidated the intelligentsia and the university. Both academicians and students have maintained reservations to voice even their constitutional rights, particularly because of possible denunciation and subsequent disciplinary measures. For instance, disciplinary investigations were conducted on some students, in Ege and Dokuz Eylül Universities in İzmir, because they had sent telegrams to the Minister of Interior complaining about police pressures (44). By the law, some presidents did not permit student associations or meetings, because one of them resulted in repressive action (45). But some professors and presidents claimed that lack of dialogue between academic administrators and students caused such undesirable outcomes (46). On the other hand, in recently established private Bilkent university, which is being governed by some academic administrators of the present system, students enjoyed full-fledged democracy (47).

In the last quarter of 1985, Şahin Alpay, former research assistant in the Faculty of Education, Ankara University, collected the reactions about the CHE from many well-known academicians, leading politicians, former university presidents under the title of "The CHE File" in the Cumhuriyet newspaper. Among the main topics were the lack of university concept and academic freedom (48), despotic administration and excessive discipline (49), standardized university and the CHE ministry (50), decreasing instructional quality (51), an inventory of academicians who left or were obliged to leave the university (52), difference in academic statistics of the State Planning Organization and the CHE (53), the CHE as a hindrance to economic development (54). But the CHE has never been sensitive to social evaluations of the academic community or the press.

A few university presidents like those of the Technical University in İstanbul, the Atatürk University in Erzurum, and the Middle East Technical University in Ankara spoke evaluatively about the CHE and the lack of scientific productivity in universities. but they were replaced on the nearest occasion and in due form (55, 56, 57).



The lack of sufficient positions for academic promotions created rivalry and even enmity among academicians who had worked together and been friends for years. This dearth of academic positions has been more and more destructive to the organizational climate of Turkish universities as time has passed. The authorities concerned should know or remember that human systems function by motivation and morale.

One of the aims of education is to equip an individual with necessary civilized courage to claim his constitutional rights as a citizen, otherwise he would fail to behave so in case of any national, and particularly international crisis. A timid youth will not be able to protect the Turkish independence and the Republic in accordance with Atatürk's legacy. Nor will a timid instructor be able to educate generations with free thought, free conscience, and free knowledge as reaped by Atatürk. Among others, this has been the most vital handicap created by the extreme interpretations, and implementations of the new legislation in higher education, and the Turkish university was established in a painful state by a well-known writer (58).

#### ***Preliminary Conclusions***

The reestablished CHE which began functioning at the beginning of 1982 is claimed to have spent great effort in order to attain the three goals mentioned below:

- 1 - To universalize higher education in order to provide more opportunity of education for the youth,
- 2 - To take such measures as to train instructional staff of high quality and sufficient quantity.
- 3 - To raise the quality of education and to provide incentives for research as to improve its quality and quantity,

In the white booklet published by the CHE, some statistical data and illustrations were presented in order to prove the advancements in higher education under the new law and the new administration (59). Both the aim and the limit of this article do not unfortunately permit summarizing the whole content of the booklet. First, no method has yet been invented to increase quantity and quality simultaneously in education. Secondly, there have been both contradictory and quantitative claims. Although schooling in higher education was not mentioned in the booklet, a dependable statistician wrote that in the academic year of 1986-87, it was only % 9 (60).

It was claimed that the CHF. scattered Turkish men of science over five continents. During its administration, 4700 academicians were pushed out of universities. Among these, 1200 full professors resigned or failed to obtain an extension of appointment from their presidents, 77 were discharged from universities by the martial law and some of these upon the hidden requests of their own superiors. About 3000 instructional elements did not either have an extension of service, or their cadres were suppressed (61). In the academic year of 1986-87, in 22 faculties of education, out of 1718 members of the teaching staff; only % 3 were full professors, % 6 associate professors, and % 9 assistant professors (62). The gap was officially confirmed by the head of the Social Planning Department to the effect that in 1989 the demand for instructional staff was predicted as 2400, while no prediction about supply could be made by the CHE (63).

As soon as 22 new faculties of education were established in 1982. traditional and well started universities like Ankara and Hacettepe suggested projects to the CHE to train research assistants of the new ones as prospective instructional staff. but the CHE disregarded such contributions for reasons of its own. Years later, these were sent for graduate study to the States under costly World Bank projects staffed by spoils system, while full professors of education in traditional universities had already been trained in the best universities of that country through AID and Fulbright scholarships.

The deficiency in instructional staff caused tremendous increase in weekly teaching hours up to 25 or 30 in some cases which have hindered scientific research and academic productivity. This was illustrated in decreasing percentages of research and publication funds out of the total budget of universities between 1983-1986 years (64). An extremely central administration of higher education delayed the solutions of the issues at this level. The rapidly multiplying and sometimes contradictory regulations, the frequent changes in them, such as those in terms of graduate instruction led to significant confusion and mistakes in higher education. For instance, between 1981-85, 52 changes took place in regulations, and graduate regulations ranked first with 10 modifications (65). Therefore, because of its extensive authorities over universities and faculties, to limit the authority of the CHE has been imperative (66).

The previous "Law of Universities" numbered 1750, and the new "Law of Higher Education" numbered 2547 are at the two ends of a continuum. The former hindered the functioning of higher education as a system and the academic administrator who did not favor this concept could facilitate this

hincrance. Although the recent lavv placecl higher eclucatiør vvithin a system strueture, it concentratecl most authority in the system centre, renclering universities anel kiculties ineffeetive. The former obligecl the aclministrator to be sensetive to the aclministerecl, the latter increasecl the sensetivity of the aclministrator to his superiors. The roles and status of academicians in the former vvere vvell defineci and setled, but exceedingly cliffereniateci in the latter (67).

İt should be ovvned that the CHE, by universalizing higher education in the country renclered a valuable service. But some academicians stili prefered cquality and they did not believe that incerasing number of instructional staff and students necessarily imply efficiency in administration and researeh (68). The claim of incerasing quantity anel cquality simultaneously has alvways been open to cquestion.

One of the elepenelable documents for sectorial evaluations is the perioclie five year development plan and annual implementation progr.nms of the State Planning Organization (DPT). Six years after the establishment of the CHE, the 1988 program of the Eifth Five Year Development Plan evaluates the situation in higher education as follovvs (69):

1. Student population increasecl 7.2 percent anel sehooling ip to 11.2 percent overreaching the targets envisaged in the PEYDİ. On the other hand, before a master plan of higher education has been accoirlished, the number caf universities increasecl up to 28 vvith 23 nev faculties anel 13 vocational higher schools recently openecl and attachecl to these universities.
2. The number of instructional staff fell short of FEYDP targets, because the implementation of instructional curricula has been ineffeetive and the status of academic staff has continued to be unattractive.
3. The legalizecl compulsory transfer of associate professors ⇨ other universities, particularty to those in the country, to be promoted to full professorship has vveakened the fully eleveloped metropolitan universities.
4. The pyramiclacl elistribution of academic positions discourages nev brain povver to join universities particularly from abroacl.
5. The fact that the salaries, extra elass and copyvvright payirents of instiacticanal staff have continued to be unbalancecl vvith the services provided by them has clecreased the elemanel on academic profession.
6. Because of job insecurity for researeh assistants, fevv applications are being made for the vacancies publishecl. İn acleition to the vveakening

younger cadres, with the retirement of full professors, the total instructional staff is expected to fall short of the plan targets within the next five years.

7. Although professors from developed universities take trips to teach in new ones, because such instruction is conducted in block hours (from two to four) weeks combined, the result obtained should not be considered productive. Besides, particularly in new universities, instruction by research assistants lowers the quality of education.

8. Because the CHE has not still adopted the universal criteria of doctoral programs, any university can initiate such programs. As a result, present resources planned to raise the quality of scientific research have not been allocated to well developed departments and institutes envisaged as centers of attraction.

It should be noticed that most of the clowns repeat the same in case of the universities established in 1992. They do not live unless they are animated by administrators. This verity has been observed in the different organizational climates of Turkish universities. The president of the CHE, İlhan Doğan, sincerely believed in university reform and withstood all criticisms, some of them unconventional and even unfair (70). Being a wealthy man, he could have led a more enjoyable life in one of his houses abroad. On the other hand, he either did not prefer or tried to form an interdisciplinary and independent academic staff. Most members of the CHE were retired academicians and bureaucrats who would rather maintain positions than oppose the leader. This handicap was taken into consideration in the draft law prepared by a State Minister, Adnan Kahveci, and active service was envisaged as a condition for membership in the CHE (71). Occasionally, a few academicians stand in defense of the new law and the CHE; mostly appointed by it, and again mostly orally in symposiums or panels.

### **Issues and Trends**

The critical evaluations documented in this article do not imply the denial of the services rendered and the contributions made. Nevertheless, by dint of the unquestionable support of the Head of State, Kenan Evren, vast legal and administrative authorities, and favorable resources devoted to higher education some advancement should certainly have been made. This evaluation is intended to indicate that a great deal more could have been achieved, as stated in the report of the World Bank, through better planning and more efficient administration. In the abstracts of the report

presented in the Turkish press, it was stated that the Turkish system of education has been in a state of crisis in terms of two dimensions as diminishing resources and decreasing efficiency (72, 73, 74). What else remains to defend if the Minister of National Education of the party in power qualifies our educational system as not contemporary (75).

As time passed, criticisms and controversy concerning the CHE increased. The Minister of National Education, Hasan Celal Güzel, stated that the CHE aimed at training intimidated students and the system did not permit scientific discussion and research (76). Because of the erosion in academic staff and the unplanned increase of student populations in faculties of education, student-instructor ratios of 10:1 were normal with some as high as to most 500-000:1 (77).

The Motherland Party in power obtained only 21.80 per cent of the votes in nationwide local elections in March 1989, although it had a majority of 292 representatives out of 450 in the Grand National Assembly. This required a quick revision of the cabinet. The Minister of National Education, Hasan Celal Güzel, having fallen foul of the CHE President İhsan Doğramacı who had tridimensional economical, political, and international power, was changed. Actually, Minister Güzel violated professional tradition by appointing retired army officers to most strategic and technical positions.

The new Minister, Avni Akyol, as the 48th minister during 66 years of the Republic, and the 4th minister of the 6 years power of the Motherland Party was the Chairman of the Commission of National Education in the Assembly. He was instrumental in the enactment of the law which facilitated academic promotions without vacancies. This law, which had initially been vetoed by the Head of State, Kenan Evren, but reenacted (78), was later criticised for having lowered academic standards and created inequalities (79). He was also elected as a member of the CHE in 1984 and became familiar with its organizational climate, but left the position long before his term ended, probably because of the Presidential heat of the kitchen. Minister Akyol issued a circular letter to universities and stated that because of the incessant criticisms concerning the "Law of Higher Education" which had already been modified 15 times, and with three more bills of modification in the Parliamentary agenda; it was imperative to prepare a new draft law, and with this intention to receive and evaluate the views of universities on this subject (80). Most universities did not respond to the Ministerial request, and they did informally because of the presidential wrath.

The repetitive instability in Turkish educational policy has been most damaging in teacher education. Minister Akyol, who started in the profession from scratch as a village teacher and who received an M. A. in educational administration from the Faculty of Educational Sciences, Ankara University, was aware of the erroneous model of teacher education introduced by some omniscient members of the CITE in 1982. Because 17 educational institutes, also called pedagogical institutes in some countries, were merely titled faculties of education in spite of the departments of basic and social sciences, and only one department of educational sciences within their organization structure. This structural difference from the universal model of faculty, college, or school of education soon entailed an identity crisis in these institutions. They inclined to function as faculties of sciences or faculties of literature according to the majority of departments. As a result, most material and human resources have been utilized by such majorities and the departments of educational sciences have failed to flourish worthy of their names.

Minister Akyol convened an "Advisory Council of Teacher Education" in June 1989 composed of about 150 senior educational administrators, some of them retired university professors, and teachers. They worked on the training models, employment conditions, and social status of teachers. Almost half of the members defended the previous model of normal schools and educational institutes attached to the ministry. Almost another half favored university training within a revised and scientific model. The best solution would be to integrate departments of sciences and literature in a faculty under the same name and let the departments of education flourish as independent faculties with the exception of the Gazi Eğitim Faculty as a historic monument of teacher education. Also, an analysis of the administrative structure of the present 51 faculties of education reveals that only eight of them have professors of education, although over 70, as deans. One reason for this unbalanced distribution of positions must be the reservations of some educational scholars to assert themselves through voicing their opinions publicly. It is true that some scientists who deal with perfect systems, have more concrete system concepts than some social scientists who are frustrated by nebulous systems. Nevertheless, contemporary advanced specialization does not synchronize with a generalist approach to administration which remained in the colonial era.

This country has a sound history of education. The basic law of Vocational and Technical Education enacted in 1911 implied that these two

dimensions are inseparable. Indeed, each vocation has some techniques, and each technique contributes to a vocation. Nevertheless, the CHE established such faculties under separate names and on the same site, and the godfathers of our vocational and technical education hushed and watched this unconventional integration. First of all, every faculty provides professional or vocational education. Secondly, each member of the CHE must have gained both his or her vocation and its techniques in the same faculty. Perhaps this dichotomy can be eliminated by integrating such faculties in an independent university with a proper name.

Meanwhile in the political arena, opposition parties pressed for early elections. The previous government appeared to be one without great expectation of longevity. Therefore, it was questionable whether Minister Akyol would consider radical, albeit necessary, revision in the present model of teacher education. On the other hand, the Social Democratic and Republican Party in opposition has been so preoccupied with internal frictions and conflicts that it has overlooked many significant occasions in terms of higher education to shake the party in power on the Parliamentary floor and in view of the public opinion.

The reader will notice that most quotations are made from the press mainly for the following reasons. First, only the press has provided up to date and primary sources on the subject available to the private scholar. Second, the repetitive criticisms of journalists, academicians, and politicians serve as prima facie evidence of the insensitivity of the educational authorities in power. The reader may also notice frequent quotations from particularly some newspapers, because they rank first among others which open their columns to such guest writers as men of science and letters.

Any educational innovation should be evaluated in terms of new contributions to students and society. The significance does not lie in new system structure, but in new relationship between the system and its environment, particularly the school and the pupil. Structural innovations should follow the innovations envisaged in such relationship. Much speculation has been written and uttered on the new structure and administration of the Turkish higher education. But research is the only way to lead us to reality. This is what has been evaded so far.

Initial data derived from a study conducted by a doctoral candidate appears to justify the incessant criticism directed at the present law and its implementation. This study compares the two laws of Turkish higher education from the viewpoints of organizational structure and

administrative process by means of a statistically valid survey. The survey instrument employed 31 questions oriented to the viewpoints of (organization and administration. Administered in November, 1988 in all 27 Turkish universities, the survey was confined to full and associate professors who had served at least five years under each law governing higher education. From a potential survey population of about 5600 individuals, half were selected for data collection. Of these, one-fifth returned their completed questionnaires. The reasons for this low response were interpreted as apprehension, indifference, or alienation. Each of the 31 questions on the instrument was rated by the respondents on a five point scale for each of the two laws. These ratings were compiled as numerical scores for purpose of comparison.

The mean scores received from ratings of the laws were compared through use of appropriate t-tests in terms of such demographic variables as age, gender, academic seniority, academic level, administrative position, and source (country) of the doctoral degree. In terms of 27 responses the previous law's mean scores were significantly higher than the present law's. One could interpret this result as the subjects' collective perception that the previous law and its implementation were more professional and rational than the one in effect (81).

Since the enactment of the present law governing the Turkish higher education, the virtues of the organizational structure and administrative process it prescribes have been persistently and stoutly defended by state educational authorities without regard for its many inherent vice's. Not the least of these vices is the low regard it enjoys among the key members of the academic community, as demonstrated by this study. If the prescriptions of the current law were sound, then these academic critics would be its strongest proponents instead of its opponents. One of the first members of the CHE. authentically stated that even if this law should be modified thousands of times, it would not ensure the academic freedom and administrative autonomy of the Turkish university (82).

One of the most controversial issues in 1988 was the law numbered 5. It was claimed to facilitate academic promotion to full professional rank and thus to provide an increase in instructional staff of about 1500. This claim was justifiable to a degree inasmuch as the CHE had failed to provide the necessary instructional staff in line with the increase of the institutions of higher education during the Five Year Development Plan. Yahya Kemal Kaya, a prolific writer in education, summarized the pros and cons of the law judiciously in the Turkish Public Administration Review (83). As a result of this mass promotion, some scholars, based on



Science Citation Index comparisons, drew attention to the lowering potential of research in Turkish Universities (84).

Part of 1989 passed with judicial debates when the Parliament enacted a statute permitting wearing of turbans (head gear) by female students, and the Constitutional Court overruled it upon the application of the former Head of State, Kenan Evren (85. 86). Cahit Yahşi, Ankara public prosecutor, in a detailed article, explained that the CHE evaded its Constitutional function by omitting the terms of contemporary attire and introducing religious ones in student regulations, and therefore should be subject to legal investigation (87). In addition to newspaper article, some academicians produced and published books which included quantitative and qualitative evaluations of the CHE era in universities. Kemal Kafalı, former president of the İstanbul Technical University, in his book evaluated the 1984-1988 period quite negatively in both dimensions (88).

One of the issues of 1990 was the increasing Islamic cadres in university administrations through the good offices of the CHE. This trend was perceived as a threat to secular education and the six tenets of Atatürk (89). Many claimed that secular academicians were coerced to leave universities to be replaced by politically militant ones. It could be said that the CHE mortgaged not only the universities. but also on the future of the country (90). Some commentators traced this trend back to the military administration which started in September 1980; because after all, it was this administration which created the CHE with its trilateral missions of ideological supervision, uniform education, direct and indirect Presidential appointments of academic administrators (91).

Another issue which has continued and even worsened has been the extra-curricular employment of full-time instructional staff. The article 46 of the previous law 1750 permitted such employment only in ministries, the armed forces, state and public enterprises. The Article 38 of the new law 2547 added foundations and companies to this list. In later three modifications of the article as usual; and diluted administrative reservation, particularly after the law had delegated this authority to universities in 1991. The increasing number of such instructional staff eventually defeated the original purpose of the article to give scientific support to the public interest and turned it into a mechanism for distributing spoils in some cases. Eventually, two parliamentarians asked the elimination of the article and a return to the status quo ante (92, 93).

In 1991, criticisms towards the CHE. and the new law concentrated on medical training. İbrahim Cevlan. a renowned surgeon in Ankara

University, claimed that modification of the law was inevitable for better medical training (94). As a result of such criticisms the Parliament formed a Committee of investigation. Their findings revealed that intern-; had insufficient theoretical and practical training. In light of these findings the chairman of the Committee, Mustafa Kalemli, stated that to open new faculties of medicine under these circumstances would be a crime, *although some are still being opened*(95, 96).

As revealed in the popular press, perhaps the most shocking failure of the CHE was in the aftermath of the 1986 disaster at the nuclear power plant in Chernobyl, the former Soviet Union. Large radioactive clouds were carried south by prevailing winds over northern Turkey, tea-producing region. Three instructors in the Middle East Technical University learned through research that the tea produced along the Black Sea coast and consumed nationwide contained radiation levels that were hazardous to humans. Once this scandal surfaced in the press, the CHE instructed universities to cease further research and to suppress information already derived (97).

Although perhaps an extreme case, this affair illustrates the degree of administrative pressure which can be exerted to the detriment of academic freedom as well as scientific and intellectual integrity in the universities by a body such as the CHE. One is well-served to remember that writers in administrative science have long warned of the conflict that can arise in attempting to serve the state and current policy simultaneously. In such cases, the way is clear: loyalty is due to the state (i. e. the public), not the authors of policy.

In 1992, a culmination of issues in higher education militated for the elimination or at least reorganization of the CHE.. Academic freedom, election of administrators, promotional procedures, and diminished standards ranked high among these issues. Mahmut Acem, a well known professor of educational planning, in two articles pointed out the illegal decisions made by the CHE and emphasized the need for administrative autonomy to prevent such decisions (98, 99).

The writer draws attention to the fact that in order to reform the CHE, it is imperative to discover its original form. From the very beginning, the CHE determined higher education policy, implemented it, and inspected it. Therefore, it was *a covered minisiter' of higher education. but outside the cabinet structure.* It was not named so because, with few exceptions, such ministries are found usually in closed systems of state (100). Therefore, the starting point in reorganization is to determine whether the new CHE should be

A policy organ, an executive organ, or both.

And if the first alternative is preferred, whether it should be

A policy advising organ, or

A policy formulating organ?

The incessant criticisms from the academic community, the press, and the public seemed to justify the first alternatives, namely *a policy advising organ*. Besides it appeared that both the elementary structure and the parliamentary process necessitate them(101).

The accumulated criticisms about the CHE in the course of seven years and the desirability of placating the academic community caused the government to introduce piecemeal changes concerning the appointment of university presidents. According to a recent legal modification, in July 1992, in a university each full, associate and assistant professor on the same election day secretly voted for one candidate. Out of six candidates who collected highest votes, three were nominated by the CHE from whom one was appointed by the Head of State. There were difficulties with this procedure: Some academicians perceived the election to be a show and did not vote; others, because the election was held in August, were absent on vacation; and finally, because votes were dispersed among six candidates at the initial stage; the representative status of some presidents elect, particularly in small universities, were in question. The same modification envisaged a second procedure for 21 recently opened universities and two institutes of technology. They were appointed by the Head of State upon the nomination of the Minister of National Education and the Prime Minister (102). Although called new, most of these institutions were created from combinations of existing faculties, therefore did not really necessitate an exceptionally political system of appointment; because by the cabinet system at least two of the three would be from the same political party. This new legislation not only incapacitated the CHE, but also created a group of government appointed presidents. Two years later, they were elected by the first procedure, but during this period they helped insure their election by hand-picking academicians to fill vacancies, and 18 were reelected out of 23. On this occasion, one inexplicable incident was the replacement by the CHE one candidate president, who won 70 percent of votes, by another who got only one vote. Fortunately, the Head of State, Süleyman Demirel, showed good sense and returned the nomination (103, 104).

One unexpected repercussion from the enactment of the modification to the law was the resignation of the president of the CHE, İhsan Doğramacı. While being politically powerful, as evidenced by his eleven-year tenure

in the presidency, he was also considered the typically organizational, but hardly institutional leader of the CHE. His departure was made, more perplexing by his stated grounds: that he did not believe in choosing university administrators by election (105). This in spite of the fact that he had been named president of both Ankara and Hacettepe Universities under the same system. His position on the CHE was filled by another university president, Mehmet Sağlam, who has been professionally more elaborate, but politically less manipulative than the leader. He was expected to follow in his predecessor's footsteps, but later developments did not bear out this prophecy.

Unfortunately, most of our statesmen fail to accept that the true function of a specialist is to offer uninterested information to the decision maker. The examples enumerated so far prove that to play with nationwide systems is neither feasible nor advisable. Radicalism is both a costly and risky process, because it destroys not only undesirable, but also desirable functions of systems. It seems that Turkey awaits another educational leader like Atatürk to attain the contemporary level of education enjoyed by most of the civilized world.

While the criticisms and controversy surrounding the present law have continued since its enactment in 1981, the writer studied the programs of the last four governments: Turgut Özal, Yıldırım Akbulut, Mesut Yılmaz and Demirel-İnönü coalition. The first three exercised single party power, and the last a coalition of allegedly contrasting parties. It is both amusing and frightening that all of them included in their pre-election government programs the modification and even the omission of the present law concerning the CHE. For instance, the program of the Demirel-İnönü coalition government clearly envisaged a radical reform in higher education, the disestablishment of the CHE, the self-administration of the institutes of higher education by the organs elected from among themselves, the recognition of academic freedom, administrative and financial autonomy. Particularly İnönü, ex-president of the Middle East Technical University, and the leader of the Social Democratic Republican Party, at the time, has stated this intention since 1985 on every formal and social occasion (106). It is one of the frailties of politicians to criticize a harmful legislation when they are in opposition, but to utilize it when they come to power. *But if three great parties and their leaders in a country can not change a law of higher education, one should look for other mysterious forces which benefit by its maintenance.*

**Editors' Note:**

"Serving as Dr. Bursalioğlu's English editor permitted me to repay a small part of the debt I owe him as my Turkish language mentor, and my dear friend"

**Thomas A. York**

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. **1981 Yükseköğretim Reformu ve Altı Yıllık Uygulama Sonuçları** published by the Council of Higher Education. Ankara, 1988
2. Speech made by Selçuk Kantareoğlu in the Advisory Assembly, on January 1, 19<S2.
3. Ziya Bursalıoğlu "Üniversitelerin Örgüt Anatomisi", **Milliyet**. July, 18, 1977.
4. Ziya Bursalıoğlu "Üniversite Yenilenmesinden Ne Anlıyoruz:" **Milliyet**, December 12, 1980.
5. "Üniversitede Başlı Türbanla Örtmek Serbest" **Tercüman** Mayıs : S, 1984.
6. Statement by Ercüment Konukman, **Tercüman**. April 24, 19<S7.
7. "Kahveci'nin YÖK Taslağı" **Milliyet**. February 3, 19<S.
8. "Doğramacı YÖK'ü Savundu" **Milliyet**. February 4, 19<S.
9. "YÖK Topa Tutuklu" **Güneş**, Martlı 2ü. 1988.
10. Hasan Celal Güzel, "YÖK'le İla Var" **Tercüman**, Martlı 2J, 1988.
11. Yavuz Donai "Üniversitenin Sancısı". **Tercüman**, July 27, 1985.
12. YÖK'ün Yönetmelikleri Yaz Boz. 'tablasına ] )öncü" **Cumhuriyet** April. 30, 1985.
13. Uğur Ersoy "Üniversiteler Sanayinin Cierisinde Kaldı" **Milliyet**, October 24, 1987.
14. "YÖK Tıptan Sınıfta Kaldı" **Milliyet**. October 24. 1987.
15. İbrahim Ceylan "Türk Tıbbının Geleceği" **Milliyet**, Martlı 20, 1988.
16. Nusret Fişek "Hekimlerin Tıp Eğitimi" **Toplum ve Hekim**, Ankara, Mart, 1987.
17. Statement by Yavuz Manisalı, **Hürriyet** November 23, 19<S5.
18. "Rektörler Endişeli" **Güneş**, February 2, 19<S.
19. Vedat Yerli'ei "Mülevelli Heyetler Politika Dışında Tutulma İ" **Milliyet**, February 11, 1988.
20. Atif Ural "Mülevelli Heyeti Ancak Kaos Yaratır" **Milliyet**, February 23, 19<S8.
21. Ziya Bursalıoğlu "Yeni YÖK Yasası İyın Alan Araştırması Yapılmalı" **Milliyet**, Martlı 19, 19<S5.
22. İhsan Doğramacı "Mar.vismi Araştırana Bile Hesap Sormadık" **Tercüman**. Martlı 21, 1988.
23. "Kemal Karhan YÖK Sistemini Anlattı" **Cumhuriyet**, September 21, 1987.
24. "Üniversiteler Özerk Değil" **Milliyet**. April 13, 1986.

25. Ahmet Yayıoğlu "YÖK, Üniversitelerimiz ve Ülke Sorunları".**Milliyet**, March, 21. 1987.
26. Yaktıp Kepenek "Bilimsel Yasaklar Sürdürülüyor" **Cumhuriyet**, February 25, 1988.
27. Kemal Kafalı "YÖK Yeniden Düzenlenmeli" **Cumhuriyet**, October 2, 1987.
28. Hüseyin Hüsnü Tekişik "Öğretmenlik Mesleğinin Durumu ve Öğretmen Yetiştirme Sorunu" **Çağdaş Eğitim**, Martlı 1988.
- 29- Müfit Arcasoy "Yükseköğrenim Yasası ile İlgili Sorunlar"**Cumhuriyet**, September 1. 1986.
30. Müfit Arcasoy "2547 Sayılı Yasa ve Sorunlar"**Cumhuriyet**, October 7, 1986.
31. **Official Gazette** dated 3/6/1983 and numbered 18066.
32. **Official Gazette** dated 6/11/1983 and numbered 18213.
- 33-** "10 Çeşit Profesör" **Milliyet** April 7, 1988.
- 54.** "Profesörlük Arapsacı" **Milliyet**, June 9, 1990.
35. Doğramacı "Ziraat Doçenti Pekâla Tarih Prolbsörri Olur".**Cumhuriyet** 2 Ekim, 1985.
36. "Republic of Turkey, Education and Training Sector Survey",**World Bank Report**, 1980.
37. Hüseyin Sipahioğlu "YÖK'un Başarıyı Engelleyen Yanlış Uygulanları" **Cumhuriyet**, August 14. 1985.
38. "60.000 Üniversite Öğrencisine Af Geliyor" **Cumhuriyet** March 21, 1988.
39. Hasan Celal Güzel "Öğrenci Affına Karşı Değiliz/**Tercüman**, March 20, 1988.
40. **Hürriyet**, November 1-22. 1986.
41. Metin Emiroğlu "Bu Film Çok Gördük" **Hürriyet**, November 12, 1986.
42. Nedim Zenhilci "YÖK ve Üniversiteler", **Milliyet**, January 27, 1987.
43. Atıf Ural "Gençlerin Eğitimi Yetersiz" **Milliyet**, October 1, 1986.
44. Telgrafçı Öğrenciler Hakkında Soruşturma" **Güneş**, December 1. 1987.
45. "Üniversitede Tatsız Olay" **Milliyet**, April 30, 1988.
- 46.** "Öğrencilerden Oturma Eylemi", **Milliyet**, April 30, 1988.
47. Gencay Seylan "Nerde YÖK. Nerde Bilkent",**Cumhuriyet**, November, 1988.
- 48-54. **Cumhuriyet**, September 29-30, October 1-5, 1985.
55. Kemal Kabil "YÖK Yeniden Düzenlenmeli" **Cumhuriyet**, October 2, 1987.
56. "Rektörler de YÖK'ü eleştirdi" **Milliyet**, November 20, 1987.
57. "Üniversiteler Tek Tip Oklu" **Milliyet**, January 1, 1988.

- SS. Yavuz Donat, "Üniversitenin Sancısı" **Tercüman**, July 27, 1985.
- 5C **1981 Yükseköğretim Reformu ve Altı Yıllık Uygulama Sonuçları** published by the Council of Higher Education, Ankara, 1985.
60. Saim Kaptan "Bizi AT'a alırlar mı?". **Çağdaş Eğitim**. Haziran 1988.
61. "YÖK Türk Bilim Adamlarını Beş Kıtaya Dağıttı", **Milliyet**, May 2, 1987.
62. Hüseyin Hüsnü Tekışık "Öğretmenlik Mesleğinin Durumu" **Çağdaş Eğitim**, Martlı, 1988.
63. İlhan Dülger "Beşinci ve Gelecek Plan Döneminde Öğretmen Yetiştirmeden Beklenen Fonksiyon". **II.Ü. Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi**, 1987.
64. "Kitapsız Üniversite Modeli". **Milliyet**. January 27, 1987.
65. "YÖK'ün Yönetmelikleri Yaz. Boz Tahtasına Dönelü" **Cumhuriyet**, April 30, 1985.
66. Nedim Zenbilci "YÖK ve Üniversiteler", **Milliyet**, January 27, 1987.
67. Ziya Bursalıoğlu "Yeni YOK Yasası İçin Alan Araştırması Yapılmalı", **Milliyet**. Martlı 19, 1988.
68. Kemal Önen "Anlayamadığımız Üniversite". **Cumhuriyet**, March 12, 1988.
69. TC Başbakanlık. Devlet **Planlama Teşkilatı, Beşinci Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı** (1985-1989), 1988 Yılı Programı, p. 344-345
70. "Doğramacıya Soru: 1402'likler kadar, başörtülüler de koruyacak mısınız?" **Zaman**. Martlı 21, 1988.
71. "Kahveci'nin YOK Taslağı", **Milliyet**, February 3, 1988.
72. "Eğitime Acı Reçete", **Hürriyet**. December 10, 1986.
- 73- "Eğitimde Kriz". **Milliyet**, January 22, 1987.
74. "Eğitiminizi Özelleştirin", **Tercüman**, February 2, 1987.
75. Hasan Celal Güzel "Eğitim Sistemi Çağdaş Değil". **Sonhavadis**, Martlı 1, 1988.
76. "YÖK Cici Öğrenci Yetiştiriyor". **Milliyet**, November 1, 1988.
77. "Öğretmen Adayları Öğretmensiz", **Güneş**, January 2, 1989.
78. "Komisyon Vetoyu Dikkate Almadı - Kolay Profesörlük Avnen Geçti" **Milliyet**, Mayıs 13, 1988.
79. Yahya Kemal Kaya "3455 Sayılı Yasanın Getirdikleri ve Gözlemleri", **Çağdaş Eğitim**, May 1989.
80. MEB Talim ve Terbiye Kurulu Başkanlığı'nın 5/2/1990 tarihli 322 sayılı yazısı.
81. Gülsün A. Başkan "A Comparison of the University Law Numbered 1750 and the Higher Education Law Numbered 2547 from the Viewpoint of Organizational Structure and Administrative Process". Unpublished doctoral thesis. Ankara 1990.

82. Neşet Bilaloğlu "Mülevelli Heyetli Üniversite" **Milliyet**, January 19, 1990.
83. Yahya Kemal Kaya "3455 Sayılı Kanun Ne Getirdi ne Gölürdü ?" **A:nime İdaresi Dergisi**, June 1989, Ankara.
84. Kasım Cemal Güven "Üniversitelerimizde Araştırma Kısırlığı", **İnsan ve Kainat**, Mareh 1989.
85. Oktay Ekşi "Başörtü Davası", **Hürriyet**, March 9, 1989.
86. Cahit Tanyol "Turhan Tartışması", **Güneş**, March 9, 1989.
87. Cahit Yahşi. "YÖK Sorununu İrdeleme". **Cumhuriyet**, January 10, 1990.
88. Kemal Kalalı. **Üniversitelerimiz Nereden Nereye Getirildi?** 1989. İstanbul, p. 136.
89. Çetin Yelin, "Üniversite İslamcılara Emanet", **Milliyet**, May 5, 1990
90. Neeib Hablemiloğlu "YÖK Dramı ve Üniversitelerimiz" **Milliyet**. November 6, 1990.
91. Gencay Seylan "Ve 12 Eylül YÖK'ü Yaram". **Cumhuriyet**, October 31, 1988.
92. "Uyanık Profesörler - Yüzlercesi Üniversiteye Uğramadan Maaş Alıyor" **Milliyet**, August 7, 1990-
- 93- "Üniversitede Yağma". **Milliyet**. August 8, 1990.
94. İbrahim Oylan, "Yükseköğretim Kanunu Değiştirilmelidir". **Milliyet**, May 22, 1991.
95. "Tıp Fakültesi Mezunu Yarı Cahil", **Güneş**, May 25, 1991.
96. "Tıp Eğitimi Bitkisel Hayatla", **Güneş**, May 27, 1991.
97. "YÖK'ten Üniversitelere Talimat: Radyasyon Sonuçlarını Dıyırırıyor" **Milliyet**, December 27, 1992.
98. Mahmut Adem "YÖK'tin Yasadışı Uygulamaları", **Cumhuriyet** May 1, 1990
- 99. Mahmut Adem, "Neden Üniversite Özerkliği?" **Cumhuriyet**, November 11, 1991.
100. Ziya Bursalıoğlu "Nasıl Bir YÖK" **Cumhuriyet**, January 5, 1992.
101. Ziya Bursalıoğlu "Nasıl Bir Yükseköğretim Yasası?" **Çağdaş Eğitim**. October, 1992.
102. Lavvsnumberecl3826and.3(8.37, clatecljuly 1 ancljuly 3, 1992.
- 103- Abbas Güçlü. "Aslan YÖK" **Milliyet**. November 3, 1991.
104. "Prof. Ural Tekrar Rektör" **Milliyet**, November 5, 1994.
105. "Doğramacıdan Pes" **Günaydın**, July 14, 1992.
106. Erdal İnönü "YÖK'ü Değiştireceğiz" **Cumhuriyet**, October 5, 1985.